

Analysis of a sample of the article made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

<i>Radical.</i>	<i>Grams per liter.</i>	<i>Hypothetical combinations.</i>	<i>Grams per liter.</i>
Chlorid (Cl)-----	1.134	Sodium chlorid (NaCl)-----	1.869
Sulphate (SO ₄)-----	47.080	Sodium sulphate (Na ₂ SO ₄)---	30.480
Bicarbonate (HCO ₃)-----	.000	Magnesium sulphate (MgSO ₄)--	32.870
Sodium (Na) (by difference)---	10.604	Calcium sulphate (CaSO ₄)----	.339
Magnesium (Mg)-----	6.640		
Calcium (Ca)-----	.100		
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	65.558		65.558

Bacteriological examination of 8 bottles showed the following results: Maximum count of bacteria per cc.: At 20° C., 440,000; at 37° C., 1,000,000. *B. coli*: In 10 cc., 8 bottles; in 1 cc., 4 bottles; in 0.1 cc., 2 bottles.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal and vegetable substance.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement borne on the label, to wit, "Analysis—Parts per 1,000 Sodium Sulphate 55.2, Magnesium Sulphate 55.2, Sodium Chloride 2.1," was false and misleading in that it represented to purchasers thereof that each unit of the same contained not less than 55.2 parts for each thousand of sodium sulphate and the same proportion of magnesium sulphate, and 2.1 parts for each thousand of sodium chlorid, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchasers into the belief that it contained a proportion of 55.2 parts of sodium sulphate, 55.2 parts of magnesium sulphate, and 2.1 parts of sodium chlorid in each one thousand parts of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, it contained less than the above-mentioned proportions of said substances, and for the further reason that the following statement borne on the label, to wit, "A Concentrated Saline Purgative Water," was false and misleading in that it represented to purchasers that the article was a natural mineral water, whereas, in fact and in truth, it was not, but was an artificial mineral water. It was alleged in substance that the article was misbranded for the further reason that certain statements appearing on the labels of the bottles falsely and fraudulently represented it as a remedy, treatment, and cure for diseases of the kidneys, liver, and stomach, for piles, obesity, blood, and skin affections, rheumatism, gout, malaria, all kinds of stomach disorders, intestinal indigestion, and paresis, and for dysentery, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On October 15, 1919, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7536. Misbranding of Reuter's Little Pills for the Liver. U. S. * * * v. Barclay & Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 11128. I. S. No. 17003-r.)

On January 3, 1920, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Barclay & Co., a corporation, doing business at New York, N. Y., alleging ship-

ment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on June 10, 1918, from the State of New York into the Territory of Porto Rico, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Reuter's Little Pills for the Liver," which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained aloin, strychnine, atropine, and emetine, indicating the presence of nux vomica, belladonna, and ipecac.

It was alleged in substance in the information that the article was misbranded for the reason that certain statements, appearing on the labels of the boxes and cartons, falsely and fraudulently represented it as a treatment, remedy, and cure for dyspepsia, headache, flatulence, inaction of the liver, vertigo, nausea, and bad feeling, when, in truth and in fact, it was not. It was alleged in substance that the article was misbranded for the further reason that certain statements, included in the circular accompanying the article, falsely and fraudulently represented it as a treatment, remedy, and cure for dyspepsia, indigestion, loss of appetite, vertigo, vomiting, yellow jaundice, clogged liver, enlarged liver, hard liver, scurvy, pimples, blotches, boils, running sores, ring worms, scaly scalp, cold sweat, cold hands, cold feet, cramps, colic, blind piles, or tape worms, catarrh of the bowels, sore eyes, spots before the eyes, ringing in the ears, running ears, insomnia, nightmare, nervous trembling, faintness, pains, sore tongue, cold sores, canker sores, sore throat, hacking cough, shortness of breath, discolored urine, burning, rheumatism, backache, diabetes, bladder inflammation, stones in the bladder, gravel, sick headache, nervous headache, biliousness, irritability, forgetfulness, impaired memory, lack of concentration, depressed feeling, melancholia, throbbing of the heart, bad circulation, and pain around the heart, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On January 7, 1920, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7537. Misbranding of ordinary cottonseed cake and cottonseed meal or cake. U. S. * * * v. Brazos Valley Cotton Oil Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 11134. I. S. Nos. 5922-r, 5925-r.)

On November 8, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Brazos Valley Cotton Oil Co., a corporation, Waco, Tex., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about November 18, and November 6, 1918, from the State of Texas into the State of Kansas, of quantities of articles, labeled in part "Ordinary Cotton Seed Cake" and "Cotton Seed Meal or Cake," respectively, which were misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the articles made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the cake contained 40.25 per cent of protein and that the meal or cake contained 37.88 per cent of protein.

Misbranding of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement appearing on the label, to wit, "Protein Not less than 43.00%," was false and misleading in that it represented to the purchaser that the article contained 43 per cent of protein, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it contained not less than 43 per cent of protein, whereas, in fact and in truth, it contained less than 43 per cent of protein.